

REMARKS

Claim 36 recites "mapping addresses in a single address space to resources within a set of multiple programmable units" where the single address space includes "addresses for different ones of the resources in different ones of the multiple programmable units". The Final Office Action rejected independent claim 36 as obvious over Tremblay (U.S. 6,212,604) in view of Sharma (U.S. 6,055,605). In particular, the Action relied on Tremblay's teaching of "registers specified in the instruction and the registers in P1 processor 208" for teaching the recited limitation. However, the Action identifies a single resource in one processor, not different resources in different ones of the multiple programmable units as recited by claim 36. Accordingly, the Action failed to identify a teaching of the recited elements of claim 36. The Action also fails to specify in Tremblay what is being deemed the single address space mapping the different resources in the different programmable units.

Accordingly, Attorney for Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 36 and, for at least the same reasons, its corresponding dependent claims.

If any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/11/2010

/Robert A. Greenberg/
Robert A. Greenberg
Attorney for Intel®
Reg. No. 44,133
(978) 553-2060